

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
USSN 10,800,674

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

[Press F11]

Attachment: Annotated Sheet(s)
Replacement Sheet(s)
New Sheet(s)

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
USSN 10,800,674

REMARKS

Claims 13-15 and 17-20 remain in the application, claim 16 having been canceled and its limitations incorporated into claim 13. Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

With claim 16 now incorporated into claim 13 so that the broadest claim now standing in the application corresponds to previous claim 16, only the rejection of claim 16 need be discussed herein. Claim 16 stands rejected as unpatentable over Smith in view of Andrieu and Urabe et al, and further in view of Middleton et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 16, now claim 13, differs from Smith in that claim 13 recites:

- a) the braiding (3) is made of monofilaments
- b) the diameter of the monofilaments is between 0.15 and 0.25 mm
- c) the monofilaments contain a flame retardant agent
- d) the cable has a metal braided shield (5) surrounding the core
- e) a separation layer (6) of a non-woven material or a plastic foil is between the braiding (3) and the braided shield (5).

The examiner has relied on Andrieu to teach the monofilament braid, but Andrieu teaches a braid with monofilament in the warp direction and multifilaments 11 in the fill direction. Andrieu does not show a braid formed by monofilaments only. The braid of Andrieu is not capable of withstanding strong radial forces, because the fibers of the multifilament will get out of the way when exposed to a radial pressure. Claim 13 has been amended to clarify that the braid is a braid of monofilaments only.

The examiner has not cited any art as allegedly teaching feature (c).

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
USSN 10,800,674

In rejecting claim 16, the examiner has relied on four references, requiring that selective features be adopted from each of the different references and combined in a particular way to achieve the claimed invention. This would not have been obvious without more specific direction than what is found in the art. Further, and importantly, even with the references combined in the manner proposed by the examiner there are features of claim 13, specifically the braid consisting of monofilaments and the use of a flame retardant material, which are not taught in any of the references and therefore could not result from any obvious combination of the references. Accordingly, it is submitted that all claims patentably distinguish over the prior art.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 13, 2006

/DJCushing/
David J. Cushing
Registration No. 28,703